

The Republican.

No. 2. Vol. VI.] LONDON, FRIDAY, June 7, 1822. [PRICE 6d.

TO THE REPUBLICANS OF THE ISLAND OF GREAT BRITAIN.

Dorchester Gaol, June 2,

CITIZENS,

Year 3, of the Spanish Revolution.

THE subject of my present address is the subject of UNION AMONG REFORMERS, in which I shall endeavour to enquire and to show you upon what point *alone* a useful and effectual union can take place.

In this Island a very great majority of the people have determined upon the necessity and are bent upon the act of reforming the System of Government under which we live. It is admitted by this great majority, that the existing system is bad and pernicious to the general interest. On this point we are all agreed; but on the manner of reforming it, or as to the future form, we are divided, and that into many distinct divisions. Among those divisions, or as one of them, you, the Republicans, are comprised. You demand the right of a complete Elective or Representative System of Government; that is, you first wish that every man shall give his voice towards electing a representative to become his legislator; and after your laws are made, you further contend for the important right of choosing your own magistrates to execute them, or that every man shall hold the same power to choose his magistrate as his legislator, leaving to the Legislature, as a whole, the power to choose an Executive for its acts in the gross, or rather such of its acts as relate to our interests with foreign powers, and a central power at home.

Next stands that division of persons who call themselves Radicals; or Radical Reformers, and who contend for nothing further than to have a branch of the Legislature in their possession, or a controul in the House of Commons; allowing two powers of opposite interests to exist with the power of controul over that branch. This they very

strangely call a Radical Reform, but which you, Republicans, consider to be nothing more than a complete humbug and hotch-potch, as a system, but which you readily admit would give the people more power and influence than they have at present, and would lead on to still further Reform, or to that for which you contend for, at once. You say that cannot be called a Radical Reform which leaves any part of the present corrupt system unreformed, and contend that you are the only Radical Reformers; although you do not boast of the epithet of Radicals, seeing, that like most other epithets that are without principles well defined, it is become really corrupt, by being taken up as an epithet by men who will avow no definite principles, but contend that the name is sufficient.

Then come the Moderate Reformers, as they are called, who, by way of throwing a tub to the whale, will allow a slight change to be made in the construction of the present House of Commons, but profess to be shocked at the idea of Annual Parliaments and Universal Suffrage. These men, so far from being moderate in their views, are divided among themselves in a most immoderate manner, and each has his own little scheme for changing a borough, for excluding a certain portion of the Placemen from the House, for shortening the present duration of Parliaments, some for giving a suffrage to one district, some to another, and others for different degrees of extending the suffrage alike all over the country. But all this is like the system of the Radicals, humbug and hotch-potch—all a delusion.

The immoderate Moderates are all accusing each other of going too far, or not far enough; but they universally look at the Radicals and Republicans with horror and trembling, and feel as a painted female would feel at the idea of having her colours disturbed by a rude embrace, or an accident by pressure in a public company. They fear their prettiness and finery would be all spoiled by coming in contact with the vulgar Radicals and Republicans. They will therefore hold no kind of communion or parley with them, and they are the men who are the real supporters of the corrupt system under which we live. They are, in fact, worse than the managers of that system. Such men are those called Whigs.

Next the Radicals, feeling that they stand in the midway between all parties, cry out for union upon their ground, and say to one party, you ought to come down, and to the other, you ought to come up to us; whilst they are treated

with indifference and even contempt on both sides, as resting on nothing that is stable and well understood, and the only argument they offer for the union is, that "*if you were all as we are, we should be more in numbers!*" About their principles they cannot say a word, knowing that they will not bear comparison with those defined by the Republicans.

Union can only be useful so far as it tends to effect a useful object; therefore, union, upon any but sound principles, upon such principles as cannot be impeached, is not only useless, but mischievous. If an honest and useful union be required, the only ground to proceed upon is first to examine principles, to select those that cannot be impeached, and then make them the standard for union, instead of setting up the names of men for sign-posts, and crying out, "Come, all good people, look at them and shout, as nothing else is required from you but to pay your weekly pennies to support our show; which, if you will do, you shall be excused from all further struggle for your liberties, as some half dozen of us, like the Catholic Priests, will take the burthen upon ourselves, so as you support us well with your pay. Never mind the consequences whilst we enable you to jog through life so easy." This is exactly the principle upon which that useless, corrupt thing called the Great Northern Radical Union is founded, and although its advocates begin to grow ashamed of its originally avowed principles, they cannot mend or cover the thing any way. "It is ridiculous, it is preposterous," say they, "to suppose that we had an idea of buying up the corruptions of the House of Commons." Ridiculous and preposterous as may be such a supposition or idea, it is notorious that this was the avowed purpose and ground of union; and there was nothing said about its being "ridiculous or preposterous" until it was so shewn to be by the Republicans. Calculations were actually made and put forth as to what number of pennies would make £25,000; and this sum was stated to be the price of five boroughs, which were to be purchased for Messrs. Hunt, Cartwright, Wooler, Wolseley, and Northmore, or Cobbett, just as Mr. Cobbett should behave himself towards this great Radical Union, and puff it and its managers, or puff them not! In neglecting so to puff it, Mr. C.'s name is struck out of the books! It is further notorious, that calculations have been made as to what number of pennies would buy all the boroughs, and change the course of the agents of corruption, and this has been pompously put forth as "*fighting the Boroughmongers with their*

own weapons." This is a species of drivelling upon which the Radicals call us to join them! No, Republicans we will not unite with them upon any such principles: they are corrupt, inefficient, and stand impeached; whilst they find no defenders even from among those who have proposed them as a focus for union. The only defence that I have heard, is, "let those who like to subscribe to the Great Radical Northern Union so subscribe, and you who do not like it, be so good as not to laugh at those who do." This of course is a very powerful defence of a principle for union that is to overthrow the whole of the present host of Boroughmongers, and give us a change among the proprietors of the boroughmongering system! The Jews will get hold of the land long before the Radicals get hold of the Boroughs, if they proceed upon their present system.

Other general arguments on the necessity of union have been put forth, in which we are told, that we ought to lay aside all distinctions but that of Reformers, and all unite on that term to put down the tyranny that oppresses us. All this would do very well if we were in the same situation as the Greeks, if we were actually in arms against our Turks; but as we are not so in arms, and as we are, and shall probably for some time be obliged to continue, progressing towards Reform by the power of the printing press, and by disseminating knowledge among the mass of the people, it is of the greatest importance that we should not lay aside those distinctions which define our principles, but that we should unite for no other purpose but to propagate the best principles, or such as cannot be impeached, but we are instantly ready to defend them to the letter. If we were actually in arms against our Turks, then the man would be a traitor that should attempt to divide our armed forces by nominal distinctions; so long as the whole were united for the destruction of tyranny. As the case now stands, the only duty of the honest Reformer is, to propagate or to assist in propagating, the best principles; and if there be yet no determination as to which are best, let us discuss them; there can be no better time for that purpose than the present, for we are actually doing nothing else, nor is there a prospect of doing any thing in any other shape for the moment. We cannot therefore be better employed than in discussing and propagating the best principles; and unions for any other purpose will lead to nothing but increased disunions.

I admit the word or epithet *Reformer* is as good as that of *Republican*, if it be made the emblem of the same princi-

ples. It is to the principles we must look and not to the nominal distinction. I have never used the word *Republican* as an epithet, without a full explanation of the principles on which I have found it: can the Reformers, radical or moderate, say as much for themselves? If a man tells me that he is a Radical Reformer, and I show him that the principles upon which he founds that term will not produce Radical Reform, without calling in the aid of other principles; can he honestly adhere to that name upon his own alleged principles, without avowing the others that prove his own inefficient to his avowed object? Before the Radicals say any more about union upon their inefficient rotten principles, let them answer this question.

This, Republicans, is our answer to the manifesto which has lately been issued from the Radical Head Quarters on the subject of Union. We will unite, we wish to unite, but that union must be both honest and useful; it must be founded upon principles that cannot be shaken, nor shewn to be corrupt in the least degree. If the Radicals can shew us that there is any thing corrupt in the principles we advocate, and for the practice for which we contend, we will set them an example instantly and shake off, and in future disown, whatever they prove to be corrupt.

This then is our manifesto to them in reply to the one they have put forth; this is the ground upon which we will meet them and unite. If they can shew us that all we wish to abolish are not corruptions or not really mischievous to the general interests; if they can shew us that by demanding so much we even delay the acquisition of a part, we will yield to them and unite nearer their own ground; but if they cannot do this, and still persist in withholding themselves from our ranks, we know what conclusions to draw from their motives and conduct, and we will continue to denounce and to impeach their principles.

I am one of those who think we have never lost any thing by asking too much; but rather, that we have never gained any thing by not asking enough. Let the Radicals shew the contrary; and let the Whigs be silent until they can do the same.

Republicans, hold on to your principles; your perseverance, determined resolution, and example have disconcerted both Radicals and Whigs. Like all other corrupt factions, they would all unite to persecute us, or to put us down, and you need not be surprised if you see some such attempt as this take place. But bear in mind this one grand axiom:

that good principles will always triumph over those that are bad, whatever may be the momentary inequality of numerical support. Unless, then, they can combat our principles, we will not heed their attacks upon our persons. We will not fear them; we shall certainly thin their ranks, and draw off every one that has a spark of honesty about him, by continuing to hold up better principles to their view. Be this then our conduct; be this our line of march; be this our resolution, and we shall always feel the satisfaction in saying, we were among the first in the Island of Great Britain that started fair, and in the right path to the Goal of Liberty.

Let us once hear Russia actually at war with Turkey, and many months will not elapse before France, Spain, and Portugal will revolutionize themselves into Republics. Then adieu to British Monarchy; may it never return.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. D. KING.

A part of this Letter having been omitted last Week for want of room, we have thought it requisite to reprint the whole in our present Number, that our Readers might have the entire Letter before them.

CITIZEN, Dorchester Gaol, May 26.

ACCEPT my thanks for taking upon you the two thousandth part of mine and my sister's fines, for though I am willing to give up every atom of my own property towards meeting them, I do hold it to be the duty of every man who calls himself an enemy to persecution, whether he be of my opinion or not, to take a portion of those fines upon himself. My crime, and that of my sister, is the publication of a book that questions the truth and validity of the Christian system of religion. I published that book under a conviction that it contained more truth than does the Christian system of religion, or all the books connected with that system: and in doing this I conceived I performed a duty, a virtuous duty, as a member of the community, under an impression, that whatever is questionable as to its truth or nominal value, ought to be questioned for the good of that community. My sister published her book as my agent, and at my request, when she saw I had need of her assistance from the penalties that she conceived had been unjustly heaped upon me. This is the extent of her crime. Is there, I would ask, a man in being, calling himself a Christian,

who would wish to preserve the form of the Christian religion if it can be shewn to be founded in falsehood and corruption? If there be such a man he must be corrupt and dishonest. Since, then, the Christian religion is questionable; since it has been questioned by thousands of the best informed men, by men who, above all others, were the most competent to judge, and whose judgment must have been impartial because it militated against their private and individual interest; since this has notoriously been the case, I take upon me to say, that no honest, no rational man can be living in this country but must deprecate my persecutions, and must feel himself persecuted through me, and ought to share the burthens thrown upon me. It matters not whether he be Christian, Jew, or Turk, if he be honest, he must feel himself wounded and persecuted through me. If he values his religion only because he thinks it to be the most pure, he must feel a doubt on his mind when that religion is questioned, and when it is notorious that the person who so questions it has only been met by an imprisonment of his body and a destruction of his property. Ought he not, then, as an honest man, to demand that the religion which he values, because he thinks and wishes to prove it the most pure, should be submitted to the severest scrutiny, and that such scrutiny should be rather rewarded than punished? If this be not the case, if the Priests and members of the Christian religion, whether Catholics, Protestants, or Dissenters from both, continue to encourage the persecution of those who question the dogmas on which their religion has its foundation, if they do not demand that persecutions shall cease on that ground, can they lay claim to morality? Can they feel any thing like true happiness of mind under such a dilemma as that in which they place themselves, by saying, that their religion is from God, and acting as if they feared a man could overthrow it with a pen and a Printing-Press? Does not such conduct display fear and corruption; and is it not a proof that such a religion can neither promote morality nor give solace to the mind? Let those who think otherwise prove it by their actions.

I, for my part, could never see any difference in the sects or grades of the Christian religion. The man who, among the Freethinking Christians of Jewin Street Crescent, talks about the resurrection of Jesus being a guarantee for the resurrection of the whole human race, and who teaches about spirits or souls, is as much a Priest, a Jesuit, or an Impostor as the Pope of Rome. The Priest of the Greek

Church, of the Church of Rome, of the Church of England, or of any Dissenting Church, is the same man; it is only a variegated system of robbery, alike in its effects upon the persons robbed. There is no unison between the doctrines and the actions of any of them. As there is no consistency in the very book on which it is pretended their religion is founded, there never was, it cannot be expected there should be, any consistency to be found in any one sect that has been formed upon the dogmas of that book.

As to Dr. Rudge and Parson Wait, if they have served their own purposes they have served ours as well; for nothing could be more contemptible than the Doctor's promising me his opinions upon "The Age of Reason," or beginning to review it and then giving it up when he came to the first knotty point, lest he should *cause some brother to offend* by proceeding. The latter Gentleman I believe to be a poor, harmless creature, who had just sense enough to read his Liturgy or a printed sermon, and none for any thing else but to count his tithes or his salary. In the parable of the good Samaritan they have acted the parts of the Priest and the Levite. They are receivers, they have nothing to give. Even the recondite James Humphrey has promised me five shillings when I have cleared his head of all the weeds in it, which will be another such a task as Hercules found with the Augean stable; and this he calls buying my opposition! This is the Christian charity. He promises to spend some pounds to publish in the channels of Superstition that I cannot root out those weeds; but if I should succeed, I am to have five shillings for my trouble! Let us hear no more about Christian charity; and after this let me entreat Mr. Humphrey never to put his name to a subscription for me. Christian charity begins and ends at home. I will not build upon it. Robbery, not charity, is the characteristic of the Christian religion.

I am, Citizen, yours respectfully,

R. CARLILE.

A DEIST'S CREED.

I BELIEVE that matter and its motion, infinitely modified and combined, constitute what may be denominated the powers of Nature, which is my only God.

I do not believe that this God was ever revealed to man, (except

in the works of Nature) either by words, writings, or messengers.

I believe a man may be strictly moral and virtuous without being a member of any religious sect.

I believe the book called the Bible to be an imposition on the world.

I do not believe in the story of Jesus Christ, as I never could find any proof of the existence of such a person.

I do not believe in a future state of existence, as there is nothing in Nature to sanction it. The doctrine must have been invented by Priests for the purpose of terrifying and enslaving mankind.

I do not believe in miracles, as they must be violations of the laws of Nature.

I do not believe in Heaven or Hell; nor in the existence of angels, devils, ghosts, apparitions, or witches; nor in any thing supernatural.

C. B.

TO MR. R. CARLILE.

SIR,

London, May 29, 1822.

As I think you, and all who have made common cause with you, are unjustly punished, and as I am convinced that what you contend for is the inherent right of every man and woman, that is, to hold what opinions they think most reasonable, and to publish them without any obstruction, I think it a duty I owe to my husband and my country, to enter the lists against the enemies of free discussion, and of the liberty and happiness of mankind; I, therefore, Sir, not at all deterred by the infamous sentence passed upon my husband by that vile supporter of Murray and his crew, *Little Jeff*, nor that on Mr. Boyle by *Jeff's* successor, indeed, Mr. Denman, offer myself to go into your shop to sell openly, or by clock-work, as you think fit, any thing you have, or may publish. I am ready at a moment's notice; and should I have the honour to be prosecuted for the publication of truth, I shall always feel a conscious pride in having done the best I can towards defeating the petty tyrants of the surviving Gang in Essex Street.

With respects to Mrs. Carlile and your Sister, and wishing Mrs. C. every comfort a Prison can afford in her critical situation, I remain, Sir, yours, with the greatest esteem,

EMMA V. HOLMES.

The assistance of Mrs. Holmes shall be accepted as soon as ever an opportunity offers. There are three individuals now waiting their turns to defend the right of free discussion upon all subjects, particularly the opinions they themselves

hold, or those denominated Deistical—and if they will not suffice for Corruption's host, Mrs. Holmes shall take her turn.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. COMMON SERGEANT DENMAN,

*On the first Specimen of his Judgeship in his new Field
for Chivalry.*

SIR,

Dorchester Gaol, May 30, 1822.

I BEGIN to fear that my efforts to destroy superstition will be vain, since the doctrines of *metamorphosis* and *metempsychosis* have so striking and so powerful a support in your person and example. Whether you have caught the mantle or the spirit of the late Recorder, or the late Common Sergeant, or of both, or whether there be a contagion connected with the seat on which they sat, it is difficult for me to say or to believe, but that you seem ambitious of imitating them, you have taken the first opportunity to convince us, for the first judicial act with which your name has been coupled in the Public Papers was an act of childish folly and stupidity; the second an act of gross and corrupt villainy.

The first was a decision in the case of the Juryman who begged to be excused from serving on account of having a defect in the organs of one ear, although it was proved to the satisfaction of the Court, that the organs of the other were as perfect and useful as if both were perfect. A sort of doubt arose as to the propriety of excusing such a man from serving, but it was decided by your saying, that a Juryman ought to have an ear for both sides of the question, or one for the prisoner as well as one for the prosecutor. This has been trumpeted forth as a specimen of your legal wit and judicial impartiality, but the fact is, that the expression and the act was the reverse of both. A man who has a defect in the organs of one eye, or one ear, and has the other perfect, is as perfect in his intellect and comprehension, and as quick of discernment, as if both were perfect. You had every evidence before you, from the quick discernment of the man, that he was fully competent to act as a Juryman, if the reports of the Papers be true, therefore

your decision was neither wise nor just in excusing him from serving upon such grounds.

The second case is that of Humphrey Boyle, or according to the terms of his indictment, the man with name unknown, whom you have confessedly sentenced to a most severe imprisonment because he was honest, and because his object was the "amelioration of his fellow-creatures." I could scarcely believe the language imputed to you by "The Times" Newspaper did not the sentence corroborate it and put doubt out of the question. If your conduct be a specimen of what we are to expect from Whig Judges and Whig Ministers, then I, for one, will say, let us cherish those we have in preference to such a change.

As the full report of the trial will be published in a few days time, I must now confine myself to the report of "The Times" Newspaper, which, though brief, appears to me to exhibit a fair outline of the trial; and never was Judge made to appear more corrupt and more contemptible than you are made to appear by that Paper: and should I see it to be necessary, I shall take the liberty again to address you, after I have read an authentic report of the whole proceedings.

The first act of yours, which arrests my attention in reading the report from this Paper, is your acceding to the motion of Mr. Adolphus, THAT FEMALES AND BOYS SHOULD QUIT THE COURT WHILST PASSAGES WERE READING FROM THE HOLY BIBLE! Here you declared, in conjunction with the Counsel for the prosecution, that the Holy Bible was so very obscene a book, as to shock the feelings of females, and calculated to corrupt the minds of our youth! This was declared from the Bench by an English Judge, and, strange to say, in a case where a man's sole offence was a publication of that very fact which your conduct corroborated! If there was any thing like consistency or honesty of motive in the Members of the Vice Society, they would indict you and Adolphus for blaspheming the Holy Bible, for endeavouring to bring it into contempt, to the great scandal and profanation of the Christian religion, to the high displeasure of Almighty God, against the peace of our Lord the King, his crown and dignity, to the great danger of his Priests, their mitres, and heir-tithes, and to the evil example of all honest men in like case offending!

The defence made by the Defendant will best speak for itself when it appears, therefore it will be unnecessary for me to say any thing about it here: you, I understand, were

compelled to admit that it was both honest and bold, and, in your sentence of eighteen months imprisonment, you have given us a specimen of your taste for honesty and boldness; besides making the man find securities for five years against displaying any more honesty or boldness within that period. Some of the Papers have endeavoured to give the matter a turn by saying that it was the language of the Defendant that caused the Court to be cleared of women and boys; but this is a lie to help the Holy Bible. The Defendant was incapable of uttering an immoral or obscene expression but what he read for exposure from the Bible.

In summing up the case to the Jury you are first represented as defending the motives and conduct of the Constitutional Association, by saying, the Jury were not to consider whether or not the case formed part of a conspiracy to prosecute opinions, nor were they to consider the intention of the Publisher, but solely the tendency of the publication, since the Defendant had avowed the act of publishing it. This, you know, is a corrupt doctrine, and has uniformly been reprobated by honest men. The intention of the accused is always the object for the Jury to try; and if they find a malicious intention, or a verdict of Guilty, then it would be for the Judge to judge of the tendency of the act, and to punish according, upon his own responsibility. This is what, I believe, an honest lawyer (if there be such) would call the meaning of the English law in its purity. If, in the case of a person being killed by another, the Jury were to be confined to the tendency, they would merely have to find the fact, that the man was killed by the act of a certain person, to make every case of the kind a murder. The tendency of all opinions, if fairly and freely discussed, must inevitably be good; and if that free discussion existed, there would not be a hundredth part of the absurd and evil-tending opinions put forth to the world that there now are. Free discussion is like free air, it disperses corruptions and renders us healthy both in body and mind. You very corruptly and wickedly told the Jury, that they were not to "*consider whether the party writing these libels might intend some good at some distant period, but the tendency of the doctrines delivered must be considered, and the manner in which they were put forth to the public.*" The manner in which they were put forth to the public was the best manner possible. It was done in the face of day, sold to every person inclined to purchase, and given to none, whilst

there was a responsible publisher, and the writer signed his writing with his real name and address. There was nothing wrong in this part of the business, unless your *judicial chivalry* would lead you to think, that it would have been less offensive to have distributed the pamphlet clandestinely, and to have given them away like the rubbish is given called religious tracts. It is probable this may be your definition of good intention, and that a private circulation alters the tendency, in your judgment.

You seem to admit, that the party writing the libels intended a future good; then, I say, it is impossible there could have been an evil tendency connected with the act. Even if it could be shewn that a tendency to future good might produce a present evil, in a general point of view, which rather exceeds my philosophy, the tendency of the act ought to be regulated by the relative proportion of the future good to the present evil, and the intention calculated upon the same terms. My present imprisonment I consider a present evil, its tendency a future good; therefore, I balance the future against the present and consider, putting self out of the question; that even the evil of imprisonment relates to general good, but how even a present evil can be shewn with regard to the publication of such a pamphlet, or such opinions, I am at a loss to conceive, nor can I perceive any evil tendency in the matter, unless it be to spoil the robber, to moderate the fanatic, and to unmask the hypocrite. Perhaps, Mr. Denman, in his state of *metamorphosis*, may consider this to be an evil tendency, but I think it behoves the Electors of Nottingham to let him know that such is not a representation of their opinions and minds.

The question about the name of the defendant is, in my opinion, a question to be yet decided. I do not think there is the least precedent for indicting a man without a name. I am of opinion, that the strict letter of the law is, that a man is not bound to answer any call unless called by his right name. If he refuses to answer, it is for the counsel or the prosecutor to shew to the court that he is known by the name by which he has been cited, and then for the defendant to take the consequence of his refusal to answer. This case appears to be an anomaly that has arisen for the first time in this instance, and was not the case a political one, I am of opinion our political judges would supersede the record and dismiss the man, by a Writ of Habeas Corpus bringing him before them. If the name be of no consequence,

then why is there so much fuss frequently made about the lack of one christian name, or about a false christian name, or a mis-spelling of the surname? Mrs. Carlile was the first brought up without a name, but she gave her name freely, and in the present case the withholding of the name has arisen more from amusement than any thing else. I have repeatedly published the name of the present defendant, as Humphrey Boyle, which is a proof that the withholding his name was no act or design of ours, although we were disposed to annoy and put the prosecutors to expence. I have stated that he came from Leeds purposely to assist me, and have published several letters written by him. Therefore, the act of not indicting him by a name, is an act of the prosecutor and not of the defendant.

I now come to the sentence, the passing of which, with your preparatory observations, has covered you with an infamy that no future conduct can retrieve or wipe away. I look upon the sentence as much more severe than even that of Joseph Rhodes, because, it was expected that such a man as Knowlys would spit his venom and display his revenge; but for Mr. Denman, who has endeavoured to lay claim to liberality, to moderation of temper, and to being the advocate of a Reform in the whole system of government; for such a man to send another for acting upon the same principles, to a Gaol for eighteen months, and to make him find securities for five years that he will not act upon the same principles, is a species of conduct, of villany, that I confess myself at a loss for words to describe. Even Knowlys did not call upon the men to find other sureties than their own to prevent them from advocating the principles of Reform in future. If you think such conduct exhibits impartiality on your part, you are very much mistaken; it exhibits nothing but wantonness and villainy, and such, I am informed, is the general feeling in London, for I have already received letters from different individuals, who are not in the habit of indulging in censure, particularly on such men as are in the habit of making such professions as you were wont to make, and they express themselves surprized and even horror-struck at your conduct.

The report of "The Times" Newspaper says, "The Common Sergeant regretted that the Court found itself absolutely called upon in consequence of the Defence the Prisoner had read, and the expressions which had now fallen from him, to pass a much more severe sentence than he would otherwise have received." This is the first time a

Judge was ever daring enough in villainy to say he would punish a Prisoner for the defence he had made, in addition to the intended punishment for the misdemeanor charged in the indictment. We all know the thing is practised in the Court of King's Bench, but it was never so unblushingly avowed even in that Court, much less by a Common Sergeant at the Old Bailey Sessions. It has been reserved for Mr. Denman to avow the motive as well as to practise the villainy. To complete the flagrancy and inconsistency of this matter, it is only necessary that the liberal, the patriotic, and the humane junior Member for Nottingham should take up the case of the "Man with name unknown," and after presenting a petition to the House of Commons against the corrupt conduct of the City Common Sergeant, propose his impeachment and get him hanged. Mr. Denman may then preserve his consistency as a Member for the spirited town of Nottingham, and the Common Sergeant would but meet that which he richly deserves, and would receive, if justice were done upon him. I will lay it down as a maxim of humanity, that if one man causes another to receive an unjust incarceration but for one year, or but for one month, he deserves hanging, if putting to death makes any part of the laws of the country; or, in other words, the highest punishment known to the law is his due. So highly, in my opinion, ought personal liberty to be valued, and so heinous is the crime of an unjust sacrifice of it on the part of a Magistrate. Liberty and life are as near of kin as possible. Life to any sensible human being is of little value without the power of locomotion. Life is a liberty the human body derives from Nature, and Liberty is the life of the human mind. In a moral sense they are inseparable relations. Under a Representative System of Government both would be duly valued and respected: under all Monarchical and Priestly Governments, both are subject to the most shameful and shameless prodigality by the Magistrates; and you have convinced us that it is quite indifferent whether they be called Whig or Tory.

The last sentence I have to notice is given in "The Times" with inverted commas, by which the Editor means that they were words *verbatim et literatim* as spoken by you, and pretty contradiction and corruption they exhibit. In concluding your address before sentence, you are made to say to the Defendant, "Your mind is neither unenlightened nor uninstructed, and you will see that the views you now entertain can only be hostile to the general objects you

may have in view—the amelioration of your fellow-creatures. It is impossible that such publications should be suffered to exist.” Hey-day! Mr. Common Sergeant! Have you found out a method of destroying those that have circulated? No attempt was made to prosecute the pamphlet until months after the circulation was completed. The pamphlet appeared in July, and I heard of no prosecution until November, when the sale was quite exhausted. You admit the man’s motive to be an amelioration of his fellow-creatures, and, strange to say, you add, it is impossible such a motive can be allowed to exist. It is no wonder that the Editor even of “The Times” put the sentence within inverted commas, as no one unintoxicated would risk the fathering of it. Your elevation must have added vanity to a corrupt disposition, as nothing short of this could have produced such a sentence. Ever so corrupt a mind with a cool judgment would have never put it forth.

You state your object in passing so severe a sentence to have been to deter others from publishing such blasphemous works. In a former Session, a Barrister, who has frequently of late been connected with you in the same cause, stood up in that Court and boldly stated that the pamphlet contained nothing blasphemous, in the common acceptation of that word. I would call you a corrupt liar to your face, if I were to hear you say the pamphlet was blasphemous; and I should like no better sport than to dispute the truth of such an assertion with you face to face and foot to foot. Deter others from publishing such works, indeed! Why you must be a stupid blockhead, a mere ass, to put forth such an expression, after what you have witnessed and what you have heard. You can no more deter others from publishing such pamphlets than you can check the light and heat of the sun: what the latter is to life and vegetation, the former is to morals and every thing conducive to the welfare of society.

The man you had before you was both enlightened and instructed, as you observed, and his conduct before you shewed him the perfect man. He has read the writings of Thomas Paine; he has read the work, that grand and enlightening work, called Mirabaud’s “System of Nature;” and every thing that he could get at really instructive; and although he has had to earn his food, his raiment, and his books, as a mechanic, and to spare a trifle for a widowed mother, he has more good sense in his head, more virtue and morality in his heart, than you have, by devoting your

days and nights to the disgraceful records called the statutes of this country, to the corrupt and contradictory decisions of corrupt Judges, and to such useless writers as Coke and Blackstone.

I am informed, by a private letter, that in addressing the Jury, you observed, that "it was a misfortune, in this age of refined language, that the obscene parts of the Bible were not omitted." What sort of a Christian are you, Mr. Denman? Do you not know, that one part of your Holy Jew Book says, "If any man shall take away from the words of the book of this prophecy, God shall take away his part out of the book of life, and out of the holy city, and *from* the things which are written in this book." You will certainly be excommunicated from the Church for even hinting such a thing from the judgment-seat! The Priests and the Members of the Vice Society will say you are to them and their God a more daring blasphemer than myself. What is your King "Nero," the head of the Church and the sworn Defender of the Faith, to think of one of his Judges using such language from the Bench, perhaps when the women and the boys had been allowed to return into the Court, from which they had been expelled because the Bible was reading? Before another century passes, and the age of language becomes a little more refined, we shall have a Vice Society to prosecute the publication of the Bible as an obscene book, if my little pennyworth of references to the obscene parts goes on in its circulation as at present, and a few more Judges of your irreverent cast get upon the Bench.

I shall take my leave of you at present, by asking, what you think of Shackell and Co.'s three months walk in the King's Bench Prison, when contrasted with your sentence upon the virtuous and the brave Humphrey Boyle? To be sure, they made no defence, which seems to be the way to please modern Judges, and to excuse all sorts of crime! If an innocent man be accused, and offers, in a manly tone, to assert his innocence, he incurs the danger of double punishment, if his Jury be prejudiced, and should return a verdict of Guilty! This is a dreadful state of things: but this is the true state of the case, the true inference of your conduct, and that of the Judges of the Court of King's Bench; and however strong, or even coarse in some instances, (for I found a difficulty in giving expression to what I felt,) my language to you in this letter may have been, I appeal to the impartial reader to say, whether it be any thing further

than the fair and just comment of honest indignation upon such dishonest, such corrupt, such unexpected conduct as you have evinced in your judicial career.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Huddersfield, May 10, 1822.

I HAVE lately read a Number of your "Republican," in which you openly avow yourself a Materialist; I am, however, persuaded that you would not have said what you have had you considered the matter properly. It is surprizing that after professing to stand on philosophical ground so many years, you should, at last, suffer yourself to fall into mazes of inexplicable confusion. You have for several years been hacking at the principal feature in the Christian faith without marring it in the least; you have endeavoured to hide the truth of it behind anti-theological jeers, and to beat it down with impious contempt: but still its lustre is undiminished, and while you have been trying to shake the faith of Christians, thousands have embraced the same faith.

If you look round you, you must consider the work in which you are engaged very foolish; but for want of such consideration, you still proceed, and when you will end is hard to say, most likely not until you have lost the little reason you have, which seems to be already in a very poor state. You have now taken your stand of ground, which will ever deny all your pretended claims to philosophical science, after all the noise we have had about matter being and not being eternal; you have made assertions which you cannot support either by common sense or philosophy. You now say the mind of man is matter, and that there is nothing else, "all is matter." I am sure no philosopher, who is always supposed ready to define any point on which he ventures an assertion, would have said as you have. The mind of man, you say, is matter, and all is matter; you say our thoughts and ideas are matter, even time itself, if capable of definition. You say that every change that we behold is produced by matter acting upon matter; you must mean every change both in the intellectual and corporeal departments of Nature, for you say, "all is matter." If you do not come forward with your philosophical proofs, you may depend upon it, your assertions will be found too weak to persuade men of sense to believe you. Now, then, if the mind of man be matter, I wish for some proof. What I see or handle I know to be matter; let me ask you, have you at any time seen the mind? Have you handled it? Can you name a similitude for it? Or, with all your boasted philosophy, can you define it? If it be matter, as you have declared, say

what kind of matter it is. If you cannot define, acknowledge your error to the world. In your challenge to the world you speak of fiction as being distinct from matter, still you say, "the mind is matter, all is matter." What, then, is fiction? If the mind be matter, all thoughts, ideas, imaginations, fancies, fictions, &c., of which the mind at different times is composed, must be matter also. If you should say fiction is nothing, you will be asked to define nothing.

You say, "every change we behold is produced by matter acting upon matter?" How did such action produce the idea (or fiction, if you like the term better) of the non-existence of matter.

Again, every effect has one common cause, that is, the inherent action of matter, for the agency of man is (by your system) put out of question. How unnatural Nature must be—one man by its unchangeable fate is compelled to be a murderer, another to be murdered; one to oppress, another to be oppressed; one to judge with partiality, another to be the victim of his power; one to range at liberty, another to be confined within the narrow limits of a loathsome prison; one to pray, and another to treat his prayers with contempt, &c.

Now, Sir, if you can set the foregoing questions and objections at liberty, the world will admire your wisdom.

Until then, adieu,

THOMAS SHEPHERD.

TO MR. THOMAS SHEPHERD, HUDDERSFIELD.

SIR, Dorchester Gaol, June 1, 1822.

I HAVE put your letter aside until this day from the pressure of other matter towards filling the pages of my weekly publication, as I thought it vain to write until the opportunity offered for printing.

From your letter it would appear that all your knowledge of me has been derived from reading one Number of "The Republican," and from this you seem to have drawn some erroneous conclusions, when you tell me, that after professing to stand upon philosophical grounds for years, I seem now to abandon it for the mazes of inexplicable confusion. You, or any man, has a right to address me a letter, so as he pays the expence attending its conveyance, which you have honestly done, but he has a duty as well as a right to perform, both to me and himself in the matter; he should first know what he writes about; the true character of him to whom he writes; and, lastly, he should make

himself known as to his profession or situation in life. I know there are many Thomas Shepherds in the country, but, for what I now know, Thomas Shepherd, of Huddersfield, may be a fictitious name: and upon this ground, I may have excused myself from noticing the letter in that state, or of answering it. But as my addressing individuals in printed letters is a mere matter of form, and as my object is free discussion and mutual instruction with all who will correspond with me, or read what I write, so is it a matter of indifference to me whether or not there be such a person as Thomas Shepherd, of Huddersfield. I know there are good men in that town, and I know that I have friends there who may know you, and that you have written to me, and who may expect that I should answer your questions: so I proceed to that object, and pass over the few insolences with which you have prefaced them, under the same feeling as a haughty Christian feels when called an Infidel and a Christian Dog by the still more haughty follower of Mahomet. Fanatics of all sorts must be indulged with these little insolences, as they excel in nothing else that elevates their grovelling minds.

Upon my assertion that the mind of man is material, you say, what you can see or handle you know to be matter, but you ask, have I ever seen the mind, have I ever handled it; can I name a similitude for it, or can I define it? The inference of your questions is that you cannot conceive that to be matter which you cannot see. There are many things you can feel which you cannot see, such as winds and sounds, both of which are evidently material, because they strike and and act upon our bodies; and as one proof that the mind is material, it is only necessary to observe that sounds act upon it and affect it: another proof that it is material, and strictly forms a part of the nervous system of our bodies is, that it is affected by visible or invisible objects of joy, sorrow, pleasure, pain, fear and horror. If you have no idea of matter beyond what you can see and handle, the only thing that can be said is, that you are an ignorant or unreflecting man upon that part of science, or the chemical and natural properties of matter.

Whatever descriptions of matter you can handle you can see, but there are many descriptions of matter which you can see but cannot handle, such are smokes, flames, and clouds or vapours, with all the gaseous principles of matter. It is this gaseous principle of matter which staggers the ideas of you Christians and Fanatics. It is upon an ignorance of this

principle that your neighbour James Humphrey has put forth such nonsense to the world in a pamphlet addressed to me, and upon this ignorance of the gaseous principle of matter he has concluded, that it is impossible for it to be infinite or eternal, and where a combination of these gases form themselves into solid matter, he concludes that it is the work of an almighty power that creates them out of nothing, under the notion which you too seem to hold, that what you cannot see or handle is nothing or no matter.

The simple use of coal gas as a light or substitute for candles and oil will tend to open the eyes or to assist millions in comprehending the gaseous principle of matter who would with difficulty have comprehended it by other means or without such a common example. Now, the light of a candle and the light of a gas burner is one and the same thing. In one instance the gas is extracted from the tallow by the burning wick, in the other by the action of heat, or by being baked in a great fire, or in a heat sufficient to separate this one component part of coal from the others. Tallow is a substance that will evaporate into gas by a small heat or fire, whilst to evaporate the whole body of the coal, a very strong heat is required; but when the coal or the tallow candle is apparently consumed, there is no diminution of matter; that which was visible and tangible as solid matter, now exists for a time invisible and not tangible; whilst by the process of change we have derived either light or heat, or both, as we chose. The tallow or coal has evaporated and now forms part of the atmosphere in which we move and breathe.

Thus, Sir, by the action of wind or air we know there is materiality, but cannot perceive it. The action of a pair of bellows throws a strong current of air upon your fire, you know that something material must strike your fuel, you cannot see it as a cause, whilst the effect is visible in an instant: that is to say, you cannot see the current of air, but you can see the effect of its action upon the fire, and you can hear the force of the motion of that current of air. Upon something of the same principle we cannot see the materiality of the mind, but we can feel the force of its materiality, how it rouses all our passions, all our feelings and sensations, as different objects strike upon our sentient principle. As a pair of bellows is an organization prepared for the purpose of concentrating a body of air and throwing it with force on a particular object, so also is the sentient principle, or the mind of man, a peculiar organization that is fed or acted

upon the joint fluids of the atmosphere and the nervous system of the body. I do not mean to say that a pair of bellows is any similitude of the mind: I bring it forward merely as a simple case by which every one might comprehend how an invisible materiality is made to exist and to act.

The mind of man has no similitude known to man, except it be the near approaches of the same organization in other animals. It is evident to the most common ideas, that different sounds are the results of different organizations, such as those in different animals, or those in different musical instruments; so the different degrees of mind in different men or different animals are all ascribable to the variance of organization, as certain as are the different degrees of sound in different objects. An excellent proof of the materiality of the mind will be found in "Lawrence's Lecture," under the head of "Functions of the Brain." It is there clearly shewn that all disorders of the mind are disorders of the brain and the nervous system, and the supposed immateriality of the mind is completely controverted, and that in a stile that would make any sensible man ashamed of the idea ever after.

The letter you wrote to me was a portion of your mind, and that portion I can both see and handle. It was a delineation of your mind upon paper, as much as your portrait would be a delineation of your face; and as certain as that ink and paper is material, so certain is it that the power that delineated or the mind itself must be material. It was a material emanation of your sentient principle.

Another proof that the mind is material is in cases of deafness in infants. If an infant be deaf it will be also dumb and without mind, further than it learns to act by imitation, or the powers of vision. The action of sounds upon our ears evidently make one portion of the mind; and as sounds are proved to demonstration to be material, so also the inference must be correct that the mind is material. A musical instrument is the best similitude of the mind that can be found in inanimate objects. If a given instrument be perfect, it produces a perfect sound, or a sound wished for; but if accident or design injures the organization of that instrument, the sound is altered or injured also. If a grown person becomes deaf, he evidently loses a portion of his mind, or that portion that would be excited or brought into action by the voices and conversation of others, or by different sounds, though he may find a substitute in the delineation of that conversation or those sounds upon paper, or an imperfect one in the action of the fingers or face.

So far I have shewn you that there is a materiality which cannot be seen or handled, and that the mind of man is a materiality of that species; and though not visible to the eye of the body, is visible and comprehensible to what we term the mind's eye. Other proofs, doubtless, may be brought forward, but these are all that strike me at this moment, and I am now hurried or barred as to time from seeking others.

The definition I give you of mind is, that it is a portion of the organization of the human body acted upon by the fluids of the atmosphere and the body jointly, and is dependent upon a peculiarity of organization in the same manner as is the voice or life itself. Every portion of the mind, except that which is delineated upon paper or impressed upon other objects, decays and becomes defunct with the organization that produces it.

I have now to answer your question as to whether fiction be or be not material. Fiction, as an act of the mind, is material; but as it is an invention of that which has no existence, the supposed object of the fiction cannot be material, because the act is a mental lying—a wilful self-deception. Distinguish rightly between the act of the mind in feigning, and the thing feigned, and you will draw a right conclusion that the act of feigning is a material act, though the result is nothing but a deception, injurious to the body as well as to the mind, if the thing feigned be an object of terror or calculated to excite fear. Such may be considered your Heaven, your Hell, your Devil, and your jealous, revengeful God, Jehovah.

In concluding your letter you say that by my system, or upon the principles of materialism, the agency of man is put out of the question. This is a false assumption of yours. So far from my ever having written such a sentence, it is but in the course of the Fifth Volume of "The Republican" that I have distinctly stated, that the distinct power to will is alone confined to the animal organization. It is difficult to know what you mean by the agency of man; I do not think you know yourself: but when from its absence you infer that one man is necessitated to be murdered, another to murder, and so on, you display a very shallow knowledge of human nature. If one man kills another wilfully, the one is necessitated to be the murderer, the other to be murdered: but then the case is isolated, and not general; and as all human laws acknowledge the power of human will, the murderer is made responsible for his act,

and to forfeit his own life; and however he may have been necessitated by his passions, he is previously sensible of the consequences to himself likely to result from his act.

The doctrines of Liberty and Necessity are doctrines that can never be satisfactorily defined or settled, for there is a something in the human mind that seems to be above the latter, and scarcely equal to the former, as every act of the will seems to be the result of some influence, whilst the will itself seems to reject the doctrine of general necessity.

Whether this answer to your queries will satisfy you, it is not for me to judge; I have endeavoured to make them as plain as possible, and I shall always feel a pleasure in the act of reducing philosophical truths to that same simplicity of style and easiness of comprehension, as Mr. Paine and Mr. Cobbett have reduced the science of politics. I will endeavour to place myself in the medium between the most unlettered and the best lettered men, and as fast as I can comprehend the abstruse disquisitions of the latter, I will endeavour to reduce them to the simplicity of the minds of the former.

The former part of your letter was not of that description as to call upon me on the score of impartiality to insert it in "The Republican;" but as I view it as the insolence of ignorance and wounded fanaticism, I am sure it will rather lessen you where you are known, than me where I am known, by its invectives.

Your neighbour, James Humphrey, shall hear from me next week, which I expect will close our correspondence; and whether he or you receive any impression from what I have addressed to you, is but a matter of indifference to me, as to make perfect the imperfect mind of a fanatic must be a work of time and self-instruction. We never expect to make any miraculous conversions.

Yours, &c.

R. CARLILE.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Sir,

Portsea, May 28, 1822.

Be pleased to accept this further collection of our mites as the subscription of a few individuals, who feel interested in your welfare and that of your family, as persecuted individuals, and particularly in your principles, as they lead to virtue and happiness. We hope

to see the day when those principles will be acted upon, and a Republican Government founded upon the base of a complete representation of the people. Those who contend that a Government founded on any other principle than the will of the people is good, may as well say, that the West Indian task-masters are very good because they have slaves under their command, whom they can lash, lacerate, iron, and imprison with impunity. But, Sir, you are to recollect, that we are in a land of Bibles and Christians, with eight or ten thousand or more Clergymen preaching salvation to us poor famishing sinners, as a reward for our toils here below, while they are rolling in luxury and rioting on the spoils of industry. Give us example before precept, that may lead to virtue: but listening to precepts from those who live on the industry of others, without being either virtuous or industrious themselves, is that which leads many thousands into error. We confidently hope to see the day when the principles you have promulgated with such care and assiduity shall be attended to and generally adopted, as they are founded in Nature and in Truth. The principles of Materialism are truly Republican, and the principles of Republicanism are truly material, as the only principles that will give happiness and prosperity to the human species.

I am, in the behalf of the subscribers, yours,

J. ANDREWS.

	s.	d.		s.	d.
May every Tyrant's head be-			F. B.	1	0
come a cabbage, and every			By their fruits we shall know		
hair a caterpillar	0	6	them	0	8
G. R.	0	6	T. L. a Republican	1	0
W. Lamb	1	0	Truth is my Motto	1	0
H. James	1	0	James Harvey, a Friend to		
Doctor James Hallet	1	0	Reform	0	6
A Bricklayer	1	0	Age of Reason	1	0
T. a well wisher	0	6	Beware of False Prophets	0	3
G. G.	0	4	B. M. an Enemy to the black		
A Female Friend	0	3	slugs that eat up 6,000,000%		
Not Joshua that commanded			a year amongst them drawn		
the Sun.	0	6	out of the produce of in-		
One that does not believe			dus-try, others by tithes,		
that Noah and his troop			taxes, &c.	1	0
landed on Mount Ararat	2	0	S. S. a Female and Friend		
A Female who has been in			to R. Carlile	0	6
the bogs of Priestcraft but			T. J. who thinks the consci-		
now got out	1	11	ence of a Priest is like the		
R. W.	1	0	virtue of the Prostitute,		
An Enemy to the Thing that			that yields to the power of		
acts as Priest	1	0	filthy Lucre	2	0
T. C.	1	0	A Female who does not be-		
A Friend	1	8	lieve that David was a good		
Equality	0	3	man	1	0
A Veteran	1	0	A Female who has been un-		

	s.	d.		s.	d.
der water with her eyes shut, but now they are open to Reason	1	0	B. Randal an old man forty years firm and steady in the principles of Mirabaud	1	6
R. R. an Enemy to Religious Persecution	0	3	A Friend who wishes it was more	0	3
D. M. an advocate to true Republicanism	0	6	A Christian Priest for seven years, but on reading Mirabaud receded and became ashamed of the profession	1	0
Joseph Moreland	0	9	A Christian who has lost his chimeras in the infinity of matter	0	3
Richard Scarrot, an Enemy to Kingcraft and Priestcraft	1	0	J. Andrews who feels for another's woes	1	0
W. M. a Friend to free discussion	1	0	A Materialist who after walking fifty years in the dark path of Priesthood discovered the true path to Virtue	0	6
Two Friends to R. Carlile, and Enemies to his Persecutors	0	9	A Friend to liberal principles after walking in the path of error thirty-five years	1	0
Chance Customers	1	4	May every adherer to Theology support his own Priest	1	0
W. W. Hurlock, a friend to a good cause	0	6	Observe	0	2
John Nobes for my old Friend	3	2			
A Foe to all kind of oppression	1	0			
An Enemy to the great black slugs	0	2			
Not ashamed of my name but afraid of my bread	0	6			
A Friend, no name, no hanks	0	6			

TO MR. J. ANDREWS POTSEA.

CITIZEN,

Dorchester Gaol, June 3, 1822.

THE Republicans of Portsea share my thanks and esteem for this renewal of their support, and this further expression of attachment to those principles in which we proudly participate. Communicate to them my satisfaction, and the pleasure I feel to see them beginning to avow their sentiments in full. Mental reservations are a disgrace to mankind; and indicate any thing but honesty in such a country as this. When all men think, and speak as they think, they may severally begin to talk of freedom or liberty, but that man is a thorough slave, be he who he may, that holds a sentiment he fears to utter. Where the certainty of losing bread renders a mental reservation prudent and necessary, there it may be and must be excused, but where there is no such ground of excuse, I can think but lightly of the man that can submit to it.

I feel assured that if all the men and women in this country, who have given up the Christian Religion as an

imposture, would but confess it; the remaining Christians would shrink from all idea of persecution and begin to tremble for themselves; though I should be very sorry that the Christian Religion should ever lose a member from the power of persecution or intimidation: all I wish is that those who prefer remaining Christians shall pay their own Priests and all other expences attending their idolatry, as I see a motto on the subscription intimates. It is monstrous to think that I should have to pay tithes to the priest of the Christian Religion; but such has been the case even within the present year, and in default of payment, my goods and chattels were threatened with seizure. No sooner was the thief of a priest satisfied, than in came another gang of robbers and actually did seize my goods and chattels for another purpose connected with the preservation of the Christian Religion! This is Christianity! This is the peace and good will it inculcates among men! There can be no lasting peace but upon the principles of Materialism and Republicanism such as you have described.

Yours in civic esteem,

R. CARLILE.

TO THE EDITOR OF THE REPUBLICAN.

SIR,

BY your giving the following remarks a place in your next week's Republican, you will oblige a truly sincere Christian of the primitive age; one so from principle, because he is fully convinced that Christ himself, (if ever there was such a man) was a true Radical Reformer and Deist.

Yours truly,

London, May 27th 1822.

I. TELA.

Mr. Denman, the new Common Serjeant, presided this day at the Old Bailey, on one of the most extraordinary trials ever witnessed in an English Court of Law, and of course gave countenance to all its new anomalies and dangerous principles.

1. The charge was against a Bookseller's Servant for performing his duty to his employer in selling a book, an act not essentially illegal.

2. For performing this duty for his employer, in a lawful calling, he, the servant, was accused of acting maliciously and seditiously.

3. His name was unknown, because, as a servant, no criminal responsibility could attach to him for any act not essentially illegal, and therefore no guarantee is required of a servant as from a principal or housekeeper.

4. Such a case involved all the points of social subornation; for if servants were to be held criminally responsible for performing acts not essentially illegal, but only so by inference of law, no servant ought to obey any master.

5. The crime was merely of a speculative character, and as an act of the Press, not of a kind so enormous as to render any stretching of law necessary.

6. Yet the man was held, even by Mr. Denman himself, more culpable for defending himself, and his defence was urged as an aggravation of his offence.

7. In fine, Mr. Denman, as the organ of the Court, passed a sentence on this unknown servant, for performing an act for his employer not of itself essentially illegal, of Eighteen Months Imprisonment, with an obligation to find securities for five years!

Query.—Will any bookseller, in future, be able to get a servant to sell his books? Will any master be able to get a servant to perform any act as innocent as that of selling books? What will the independent Electors of Nottingham say and think of their liberal Candidate? Will the men of principle among them vote for him at the next Election? It may be hoped not! Could "Little Jeff" himself have done more? Could even "Best" himself have done more?

And finally, to crown the folly of this trial, was not the prosecution against a publication which stated the Bible to be full of obscenities? and did not the Prosecutor's Counsel himself openly acknowledge its truth, when the Defendant began to read the chapters and verses from the Bible, by moving the Court to order the females and boys to withdraw, knowing the language to be too grossly obscene for them to hear it read?

The only difference between the *mild, the humane Judge Best* and the liberal Judge Denman, is that the former punishes the Defendant for his own mode of defence, with numerous arbitrary fines, and the latter with a much longer period of imprisonment, even by his, Mr. Denman's own statement, than if he had only defended himself agreeable to the manner in which all the Judges of the present corrupt day wish Defendants to submit to their dictation.

What excuse will the saintly Evangelical Preachers make to their flocks for recommending the Holy Bible as a book which contains the only pure system of morality, when they learn that even the Society's own Counsel for the prosecution acknowledges it, in this instance, to be too obscene a book to read openly in a public Court of Justice, by his application to the Judge to have the Court cleared of all the females and boys? How will the Clergy explain this

to their female auditors? For surely they ought to require some explanation from them, before they put the book into the hands of their children. If the Clergy wish to discourage the reading of obscenity, we recommend them to examine the Penny Bible published by R. Carlile, 5, Water-Lane, Fleet-Street, wherein they will find a selection of more than thirty chapters such as those read by the Defendant in Court.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

Canterbury, May 30th, Year 1822
of the Carpenter's Wife's Son.

CITIZEN,

THE enclosed one Pound was subscribed by two of my friends towards paying a part of your Fines. I have the pleasure to inform you, that in this den of Priests your principles are gaining ground; and you may rest assured that I shall propagate them to the utmost of my power, being fully convinced that if those principles were acted upon they would produce the greatest portion of happiness among the human species. I wish you to acknowledge the receipt of the sum subscribed in the Republican, as it will not only be a satisfaction to my friends to know you have received it, but it will shew the Tyrants that you continue to receive support from all parts of the country. Give my kind respects to your Wife and Sister. In the hope that we may have a speedy and joyful Resurrection from Despotism to Liberty,

I remain, Citizen,

Your sincere Friend,

B. A.

P. S. My two Friends also desire their respects to your Wife and Sister.

TO MR. R. CARLILE, DORCHESTER GAOL.

SIR,

Newgate, May 28, 1822.

BEFORE you receive this you will have learnt that I am to be confined in the House of Correction for Eighteen Months, for the glory of God and the preservation of the true religion. You see, that

after keeping me five months in Prison, they have at last tried me without a name, so that it is evident they might have tried me sooner if they liked. I cannot say but I was pleased at the Ladies and Boys being ordered out of Court while I was reading the passages from the Bible! Lessons are daily read in churches from this book, and every means are taken to induce people to go and hear them, yet, in a Court of Law people are ordered out while this blessed book is read. Really it is laughable! When I held the book up, and declared that I had read it with attention, and that I could safely say that it was the most infamous book I ever read, several people hissed, and one gentleman on my left cried out, "Shame, shame!" Mr. Adolphus said very little more than merely repeat the indicted passages. He made very few remarks. Mr. Denman, in summing up, was pretty fair; at the close of his speech he said, "The Prisoner certainly has the merit of having made a very bold defence." And in my sentence he has proved his judicial taste for bold defences! It is said in "The Times" Paper, that when Smith said that Christ died to answer for our sins, that I asked, "Then what crime was there in that?" But it is false; I never made use of any such expression. I will send you the best account I can of the Trial, and as soon as possible. While I am here I cannot do any thing, for I must keep myself in readiness to be removed to the Compter. When upon my trial, I found that I could manage much better than I expected: I was always a timid reader in public companies, but last night I had nothing like timidity about me.

You mentioned not long ago that you would endeavour to get beds for those in the Compter; I understand they have had very bad ones since they went there, but if I can get as good a bed as I had the week I was there, I shall desire no better. Now that I am about to leave Newgate I can venture to tell you how I have lain for these last five months. A hempen mat, laid upon the floor, and three rugs for covering is all that is allowed a prisoner in Newgate: but after the first month I thought nothing of it, and I have often observed, that I believe I should get used to the regions of Pluto. Though good beds are certainly much to be desired, yet there is something which I intend to obtain at the Compter of much more consequence to me than good beds, I mean the getting of a room to ourselves. Before I took to reading political and theological writings, I was very fond of amusing myself in arithmetic, and I have still a fondness for it; therefore, if I can succeed in getting a room to ourselves, my 18 months imprisonment shall not be 18 months of my life lost; I think in 18 months I can gain some little knowledge of geometry. Grammar I cannot study—it is not at all suitable to my taste. There are 15 or 16 prisoners in the room with Holmes and Rhodes.

Yours respectfully,

H. BOYLE.

P. S. If you have seen "The New Times," you might think that I had made some immoral remarks on the Bible, but I did no such thing. When Mr. Denman asked me my motive for reading those passages from the Bible, I answered, "To prove the truth of the pamphlet which I have published."

One would imagine that Mr. Hunt thinks that you have coaxed a few "poor fellows" into a hobble that the "poor fellows" wished to be out of; but I hope you will never have any "poor fellows" connected with you that will be so poor spirited as to go crying with hat in hand to be let off a few months imprisonment. I was one of the many thousands of "poor fellows" who greeted Mr. Hunt as he passed through Leeds to York, but I suppose we were not "poor fellows" then, but "trumps." It is a great pity that any differences should exist amongst the Reformers, but I think any candid person will allow that Mr. Hunt has justly deserved the lashing you have given him. From what I have learnt of Mr. Hunt since I came to London, I think he is fonder of popular fame than of propagating sound principles amongst the ignorant.

There are those who have found fault with my mode of defence, but I am convinced that such defences are best calculated to put an end to all prosecutions for opinions:

BIRTH.

MRS. CARLILE, in Dorchester Gaol, was delivered of a Girl on June the 4th, at noon, and is as well as can be expected after a painful pregnancy and lingering labour, arising from a close confinement to one room throughout that period. Without the aid of a Priest we give the infant the name of HYPATIA, from the celebrated female philosopher of that name, who was barbarously murdered by some Christian savages, called Monks, at the instigation of St. Cyril; the particulars of which shall hereafter be related.

R. CARLILE.

TO CORRESPONDENTS.

The Character of a Soldier, and Paine's Decline and Fall of the English System of Finance, are reprinted.

Cain, a Mystery, and The Scripturian's Creed, will be shortly reprinted.

The Numbers of the Koran have commenced publishing at 3d. each.

R. Carlile returns thanks for £5 from G. G.

Joseph Rhodes returns thanks to the Friends of Liberty at the _____, Windmill Street, for a Sovereign, (not a King) by favour of Mr. Ellis.

Printed and Published by R. CARLILE, 55, Fleet Street. All Communications (post paid) are requested to be sent to Dorchester Gaol, until a further Address to some House or Shop be given.—Orders, with remittances, or references for payment, will be punctually attended to. Country Agents will find the most liberal Terms for prompt Payment.